

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

KIMBERLY ANN G.,<sup>1</sup>

Case No. 3:15-cv-01379-CL

**ORDER**

Plaintiff,

vs.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,<sup>2</sup>

Defendant.

---

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Mark Clarke filed his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) (doc. 34) on 8/22/2018 recommending that plaintiff’s Motion for Attorney Fees (doc. 32) should be granted. The matter is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

---

<sup>1</sup> In the interest of privacy, this opinion uses only the first name and the initial of the last name of the non-governmental party or parties in this case. Where applicable, this opinion uses the same designation for a non-governmental party’s immediate family member.

<sup>2</sup> Nancy A. Berryhill’s term as the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration ended on November 17, 2017, and a new Commissioner has not been appointed. The official title of the head of the Social Security Administration (“SSA”) is the “Commissioner of Social Security.” 42 U.S.C. § 902(a)(1). A “public officer who sues or is sued in an official capacity may be designated by official title rather than by name.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(d). This Court, therefore, refers to Defendant only as Commissioner of Social Security.

No objections have been timely filed. Although this relieves me of my obligation to perform a *de novo* review, I retain the obligation to “make an informed, final decision.” *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), *overruled on other grounds*, *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). The Magistrates Act does not specify a standard of review in cases where no objections are filed. *Ray v. Astrue*, 2012 WL 1598239, \*1 (D. Or. May 7, 2012). Following the recommendation of the Rules Advisory Committee, I review the F&R for “clear error on the face of the record[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (1983) (citing *Campbell v. United States District Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); *see also United States v. Vonn*, 535 U.S. 55, 64 n.6 (2002) (stating that, “[i]n the absence of a clear legislative mandate, the Advisory Committee Notes provide a reliable source of insight into the meaning of” a federal rule). Having reviewed the file of this case and Judge Clarke’s thorough order, I find no clear error.

Thus, I adopt Magistrate Judge Clarke’s F&R (doc. 34) in its entirety. Accordingly, the Motion for Attorney Fees (doc. 32) is granted. Counsel should be awarded \$6,248.25 under 42 U.S.C. § 406(b), the amount left after subtracting the \$9,500.00 in EAJA fees that have already been paid to counsel.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2018.



Ann Aiken  
United States District Judge